DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 456 JC 780 081

AUTHOR O'Mahoney, William J., Jr.
TITLE A Study of Practices for Evaluating Administrators in Selected Colleges and Universities of Four Northwestern States.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 69p.; Master's Thesis, Washington State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Junior Colleges; *Post Secondary Education; Professional Personnel; Questionnaires; *State Surveys

ABSTRACT

Sixty-four regionally accredited colleges and universities in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska were surveyed to determine what practices existed in the evaluation of their administrators and to ascertain the basis upon which the evaluations were performed. Of the 51 responding institutions, 22 were two-year colleges and 29 were four-year colleges and universities, 35 were public and 16 were private. Findings indicated that 23% of the two-year and 54% of the four-year institutions responding had no institution-wide evaluation process for non-teaching professional personnel. Respondents from both groups agreed that factors related to goals and objectives as a measure of performance and involvement by the individual in establishing objectives were highly important. Meeting goals and objectives as the only focus for evaluation was the lowest rated factor by both groups. It was concluded that two-year colleges were more accountable regarding the evaluation of their administrators, that slightly over one-half of the institutions having an evaluation process for non-teaching professionals were concerned with its effectiveness, and that the majority of colleges not having an evaluation process did not seem committed to initiating one. A list of participating institutions and the questionnaire are appended. (LH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148456

A STUDY OF PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING ADMINISTRATORS IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FOUR NORTHWESTERN STATES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William J.
O'Mahoney, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

WILLIAM J. O'MAHONEY, JR.

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Education

1978

JC 780 081

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the project report of WILLIAM J. O'MAHONEY, JR. find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Chairperson

DEDICATION

This report is dedicated to Eugene F. Short,

who had faith.

THE PRACTICE OF EVALUATING ADMINISTRATORS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

by William J. O'Mahoney Jr., M.Ed.
Washington State University, 1978

Chairperson: Raymond J. Young

The purpose of this study was to determine what practices existed among selected colleges and universities in the Northwestern part of the United States in the evaluation of their administrators and to ascertain the basis on which the evaluations were performed. The writer sought to determine the main factors and emphases of the evaluation process and whether there was a variance in practice based on type of institution, type of control, and/or size of the institution.

A selected group of institutions from the Northwest geographic area of the United States were contacted by questionnaire. Information was gathered to indicate characteristics of the institutions by type, either two-year or four-year, type of control, either public or private, and size of the institution using both headcount and full-time equivalent enrollments for fall 1976. Information was secured on the type of evaluation practice used, including formal institution-wide evaluation, formal evaluation differing by sub-unit, types of informal evaluations, and no evaluation process. This information was analyzed by institutional characteristic to detect if there were differences among institutions with different characteristics.

Fifty-one of 64 colleges and universities, or 79.7 percent, of all institutions contacted responded to the questionnaire. Thirty-five, or 69 percent, of the responses were from public institutions, and 16, or 31 percent, were from private institutions. Twenty-two of the responses were from two-year colleges, and 29 were from four-year colleges and universities, 43 and 57 percent respectively. Thirty-eight of the respondents indicated no evaluation process in effect. Sixty-two percent of private institutions and 14 percent of public institutions reported no evaluation process for administrative personnel.

Various factors used as a basis for evaluation were categorized in the areas of goals and objectives, the state of the program and restrictions placed on it, the individual's personality and style of administration, and as components of the actual process. The factors were weighted by respondents as to their level of importance in the evaluation process on a one (low) to five (high) Likert-type scale. For the purpose of categorizing the responses, the scale was divided into three equal parts to indicate low, medium, and high levels of importance. Responses were classified by size, type, and control of the institution and the weightings were averaged within these classifications.

Indications were that all institutions placed a relatively high level of importance on establishment and use of goals and objectives and the attainment of them as a measure of performance. A high level of importance was placed by respondents on the establishment of goals with the participation of the individual being evaluated, with the process of evaluation being an open one allowing the individual to evaluate his or her own performance and to respond to each level of evaluation by others. Primary use of the results of evaluation was for personal development of the individual; and, in four-year colleges they were used also for salary and placement purposes. There did not

seem to be a great variance in the practices of institutions by size and control, although two-year colleges were more active in the practice of evaluating non-teaching professional personnel, 77 percent of respondents, than were four-year institutions, 54 percent of respondents.

For future studies of this type a larger and more representative sample should be drawn to allow a better data base for considering the practice of institutions in evaluating non-teaching professional personnel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Introduction	1
Summary of Findings	2
Conclusions	3
Recommendations	4
2. INTRODUCTION	6
Background of the Study	6
Statement and Definition of the Problem	7
Need and Purpose of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	8
Scope of the Study	9
Approach and Procedures	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Description of the Data Gathering Instrument	11
Overview of the Study Report	12
3. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS ON TYPES OF EVALUATION	13
Characteristics of the Respondents	13
Type of Evaluation Practice by Institution Type and Control	14
Type of Evaluation Process by Enrollment Size and Institutional Type	16
Type of Evaluation by Staff Size and Control	18
Action to Be Taken Regarding Institutional Evaluation Practice	20
4. FINDINGS OF THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS	22
Introduction	22
Two-Year Colleges	23
Four-Year Colleges	26
Summary	29

Page

5. FINDINGS ON THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO STATE OF PROGRAMS AND RESTRICTIONS, AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STYLE 30

Introduction 30
Two-Year Colleges 31
Four-Year Colleges 34
Summary 39

6. FINDINGS ON THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS 40

Introduction 40
Two-Year Colleges 40
Four-Year Colleges 44
Summary 49

BIBLIOGRAPHY 50

APPENDIX
I. LIST OF INSTITUTIONS IN THE STUDY GROUP 51

II. THE QUESTIONNAIRE 56

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Evaluation Process Used by Type and Control of Colleges	15
II.	Percent Using Evaluation Process by Enrollment Size and Type of Institution	17
III.	Evaluation Process by Staff Size and Type of Control	19
IV.	Importance of Goals and Objectives in Two-Year Colleges	24
V.	Importance of Goals and Objectives in Four-Year Colleges	27
VI.	Importance of State of Programs and Restrictions and Personal Characteristics and Style in Two-Year Colleges	32
VII.	Importance of State of Programs and Restrictions and Personal Characteristics and Style in Four-Year Colleges	36
VIII.	Importance of Factors in the Evaluation Process for Two-Year Colleges	42
IX.	Importance of Factors in the Evaluation Process for Four-Year Colleges	46

CHAPTER 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This study was conceived to accomplish two major objectives. The first was to enter into the literature some empirical data on the practices of institutions of higher education in evaluating administrative personnel. For the purposes of this study these personnel were referred to as non-teaching professional personnel. This was done to establish that while they were not the regular academic teaching faculty they also were not the clerical and other types of staff support personnel that work in administrative offices. These data can be used by other students of higher education who might pursue this same topic, and a basic data gathering tool for future studies has been developed and included in this report.

The second purpose of this project was to provide to institutions some information on the practices of other institutions in evaluating these personnel.

The problem had several major components. Major questions related to these components were: What type of evaluation was being used, if any, for non-teaching professional personnel? Does the type of evaluation process differ according to institution type and/or size? What ascribed importance was placed on various components of the evaluation process and factors used as a basis for evaluation? Did this ascribed importance vary with institution size and type?

In order to accomplish this study, 64 regionally accredited colleges and universities were selected from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. The chief administrator of each was contacted by a letter containing an enclosed questionnaire, and nearly 80 percent responded to the study. This report contains findings from the study along with conclusions and recommendations based on them.

Summary of Findings

Based on data collected, the major findings of the study are as follows:

1. Thirty-eight percent of all the respondents indicated there was no institution wide evaluation process in effect for their non-teaching professional personnel. Those institutions included 23 and 54 percentages, respectively, of the two-year and four-year colleges and universities responding to the study. In terms of institutional control, 62 and 14 percentages, respectively, of the private and public institutions had no evaluation for these personnel.

2. Forty-three percent of the small institutions with a full-time equivalent enrollment under 2,500, 33 percent of the medium size institutions, with a full-time equivalent enrollment of 2,500 to 4,999, and 44 percent of the large size institutions with a full-time equivalent enrollment of 5,000 or more, had no evaluation process for non-teaching professionals.

3. Respondents from two-year and four-year colleges were in agreement that factors related to goals and objectives as a measure of performance and of involvement by the individual in establishing objectives were of high importance.

4. Both types of colleges place relatively high importance on the alignment of the individual's objectives and the sub-unit's program in which the individual is involved, and the accomplishment of predetermined objectives.

5. The factor rated lowest by both types of institutions as a basis for evaluation was meeting goals and objectives as the only focus for evaluation of these personnel.

6. Categories of factors related to the state of a program when assumed by an administrator and the restrictions that may institutionally be placed on that program by tradition and/or regulation, and the personal characteristics and style of administration of the individual were rated generally lower in comparison to other categories.

7. The only factor rated at the level of high importance by respondents from all two-year colleges was, "the operational status of the individual's program when he or she assumed responsibility."

8. The one factor rated at a level of high importance by respondents from all four-year colleges was, "the individual's approach to his or her decisions."

9. The factor concerned with level of institutional support provided to an individual's program was rated lowest in these categories for both two-year and four-year colleges.

10. Factors relative to the components of the evaluation process and use of the results of the evaluation were rated on a much higher level of importance than factors in other categories by respondents from both two-year and four-year institutions. Four of nine factors were rated at a level of high importance in composite ratings for both types of colleges. These factors were self-evaluation, an evaluation interview with a supervisor, the individual having the opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation, and use of the evaluation results for personal development.

11. Use of the results of the evaluation for salary and promotional purposes was rated at a level of high importance by respondents from four-year colleges. Both types of colleges agreed in rating subordinate evaluation of least importance in this category of factors.

12. There was no large variance in responses indicating specific emphasis or importance for categories of factors or among factors within the categories for institutions according to size or control.

13. Small and medium size public four-year institutions included in the study give greater emphasis to the factors within the category concerned with the process of evaluation than to factors within other categories; however, close examination of the data reveals too limited a response to allow any generalized statements.

Conclusions

Based on findings from this study the following conclusions have been formulated:

1. Percentage comparisons between public two-year and four-year colleges indicated that the two-year colleges were more accountable in terms of evaluating the performance of administrators.

2. Slightly over one-half of the institutions having an evaluation process for non-teaching professionals were concerned that the process was effective. At the same time a majority of colleges that did not have an evaluation process did not seem committed to initiating one.

3. Administrators of both two-year and four-year colleges and universities believed that factors of greatest importance in the evaluation of non-teaching professional personnel were the establishment of and accomplishment of goals and objectives.

   While specific colleges may place a high emphasis on some factors related to a consideration of the state of programs and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style as a general condition, administrators give lesser importance to these categories than others in institutional evaluation practice.

4. The process of evaluation was a category of factors like goals and objectives in levels of institutional emphasis. Importance placed on such factors as participation of the individual in establishing his or her own objectives, self-evaluation, opportunity for the individual to respond to each level of evaluation, an evaluation conference with a supervisor, and use of the results of the evaluation for personal development demonstrated the importance held by administrators for an open and participatory system of evaluation.

Recommendations

The following recommendations advanced by the writer for consideration are that:

1. All institutions establish their evaluation process in an atmosphere of maximum participation and openness for the purpose of building strong administrative teams and programs.

   Use of the evaluation process to establish and evaluate goals and objectives helps to build a team approach to administering the institutional program. Seeing both of these areas rated high by the respondents would lead one to believe that evaluation of professional personnel is a very valuable and contributing tool to the administrative process.

2. In the interest of establishing better communication and participation at the sub-unit level, a component of subordinate evaluation should be considered for all evaluation processes.

   Subordinate evaluation can be valuable in that it opens verticle lines of communication between administrators and staff for the purpose of having understanding of program goals and objectives. While a certain amount of subjective criticism, in a subordinate evaluating his superior, cannot be avoided, this type of evaluation can contribute more positively than negatively.

3. Some degree of emphasis be maintained on categories of factors related to state of programs and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style of administration to allow for circumstances that may occur in any given evaluation period.

It appears from the data collected that the majority feeling of institutions was to place a lesser emphasis on state of programs and restrictions and personal characteristics and style. This lesser importance can be interpreted to mean that an administrator will be able to perform well in spite of the constraints placed on his or her program. The writer has not found reason to disagree with this interpretation.

4. Future studies to investigate the practice of evaluation of non-teaching professional personnel use a random sample of not less than 200 colleges and universities.

In the performance of this study the investigator has found that more value could be placed on the findings of this effort if the study group were both larger and representative of all colleges and universities.

Difficulty was encountered in making more comprehensive comparisons between groups of institutions varying in size, type, and control due to the limited number of responses.

CHAPTER 2

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

As part of his studies during the summer of 1976, the investigator enrolled in the course Recent Development in Higher Education offered by Dr. Jack Cooper. Primary reading for the course was Paul Dressel's text Handbook of Academic Evaluation. In the text Dressel states, " . . . the problem with evaluating higher education administration and management is that there are no clear and generally accepted criteria of success."[1] This statement stimulated his thinking in the area of evaluation of administrators in higher education.

Having had approximately six years of community college administrative experience, the investigator was interested in methods and techniques for evaluation of administrators. A search of relatively recent literature on evaluation in higher education indicates only guidelines and theories in this regard. Dressel states, "Once such a policy is instituted, each evaluation must cover the following points: (1) goal achievement . . .; (2) personal characteristics as perceived by various individuals and groups (both above and below in the administrative hierarchy); (3) the charge or the assigned tasks when the administrator assumed the position . . . ; (4) the administrator's own perceptions and personal evaluation of the success of his or her own efforts; (5) the approach of the administrator to decision thinking;

---

[1]Paul L. Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 381.

(6) the extent to which the options and procedures of the administrator are limited by traditions, regulations, or lack of support from superiors . . . ; (7) recognition that vastly different views of administration exist . . . ."[2]

Richard Miller in Evaluating Faculty Performance devotes only a page and a half to administrative evaluation and states, "The procedure for the various levels of evaluation will need to be adapted to each institution, but the principle of evaluation--from top to bottom--should be followed."[3]

Through a search of other types of literature, including the ERIC system, the investigator was unable to find that even a small study, let alone any comprehensive work, had been done to determine what the practices are for evaluating college administators.

Statement and Definition of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to determine what practices were used in a selected group of higher education institutions in the northwest area of the United States to evaluate administrators. An analysis of the problem revealed several major components as indicated by the following questions:

1. What type of evaluation process, if any, is used for non-teaching professional personnel?
2. Does the evaluation process used for non-teaching professional personnel differ according to institutional control, type of institution, or enrollment size?
3. What importance is ascribed to specific factors related to (a) goals and objectives, (b) state of program and restrictions, (c) personal characteristics and style, and (d) the evaluation process?
4. Does the importance ascribed to specific factors differ among institutions of different types, control, and enrollment size?

---

[2]Ibid., pp. 394-395.

[3]Richard J. Miller, Evaluating Faculty Performance (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 49.

Need and Purpose of the Study

For two reasons there appeared to be a need to gather empirical data and to enter into the literature some information regarding practices in evaluating non-teaching professional administrators. Completion of such a study would provide some basic information on the existing practices of a select group of schools and would provide a basic data gathering instrument and a procedure which can be used to further expand upon the findings brought forth by this study. Secondly, information gathered could be shared with the institutions included in the study so that they would have some knowledge of the practices of other institutions.

Definition of Terms

The following definition of terms is provided to clarify references made in this report.

Non-teaching Professional: An individual who serves the institution in an administrative capacity. One who is reponsible for supervising and directing the work of other professionals in the institution.

Examples: Director of Admissions and Records, Business Managers, Dean of Students, Director of Counseling and Testing Services, Deans and Directors of Graduate or Special Programs whose teaching is limited to less than half of a full-time assignment.

University: An institution in which a major portion of the effort is devoted to research and where Doctoral Degrees are conferred. Also referred to in this study as a teaching/research institution.

Four-year Institution: An institution that confers Bachelors and Masters Degrees as a major function of the institution's purposes.

Two-year Institution: A community or junior college which has as a major function the awarding of Associate level Degrees.

Public Institution: An institution which receives a major portion of its funding from a governmental agency or tax base.

Private Institution: An institution which receives a major portion of its funding from sources other than public funds. These institutions may have contracted projects which are funded with public dollars, but accomplishment of the institution's major goals and objectives is funded from non-tax supported sources.

Scope of the Study

The study was limited to selected institutions in Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, in order to establish base data on which to draw conclusions about them.

From this Northwest geographic area, a representative group was drawn from the list of institutions accredited by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. The study group represented two-year institutions (26) and four-year colleges and universities (38). It also represented public institutions (44) and private institutions (20), providing a wide selection of schools of varying enrollment.

The sixty-four schools represented in the study group constituted 51 percent of all colleges and universities accredited by the Northwest Association. The Association also accredits institutions in three states other than those included in the study (Montana, Nevada, and Utah). Institutional information was drawn from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Higher Education Directory.[4] The study group was selected to give proportional representation to the mix of public and private schools in the geographic area but not necessarily to be representative of school size. Neither were the institutions selected by use of a procedure to obtain a statistical random sample; therefore, conclusions are limited only to data from the institutions included in this study.

Approach and Procedures

Empirical data were gathered by use of a mailed questionnaire. Return, self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided along with a letter outlining

[4]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Higher Education Directory (Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1975).

the scope and purpose of the study. Original typewritten letters with the questionnaire were addressed personally to the chief executive of each institution and mailed on May 5. Thirty-three or 51 percent of the 64 schools responded prior to a second mailing.

This second mailing included a second typewritten letter dated May 5 with an additional note at the bottom requesting response. The second request note was dated June 1, and the mailing included an additional questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped envelope. Returns were completed June 30, with a total return of fifty-one questionnaires or a total of 79.7 percent of all schools in the sample responding.

The names of all schools contacted are shown in Appendix I of the report along with an indication of whether they responded.

Limitations of the Study

A major error in procedure was committed by not field testing the questionnaire before it was distributed. A response rate of nearly 80 percent would indicate that the questionnaire was a generally sound and unambiguous instrument. Only two errors of a typographical and proof-reading nature were discovered. One was the presentation of the word "and" at the beginning of Part II, Section II as "an". The second, one that could cause a bit more concern, was the presentation of the figure 4,999 in alternative #3 in questions five and six, Part I, as 4,499. Because the response was one of a sequential series of numbers and the fact that the error could be considered obvious, the data collected did not appear to be contaminated. The investigator does not feel that a field-test of the instrument would have revealed the error as only one of the 51 respondents indicated any notice of the error.

However, a pre-test would have enabled the investigator to test the validity of the items in addition to checking the format, clarity of directions, and unambiguity of meanings.

The writer believes the data gathered, tabulated, analyzed, and presented in this report are reasonably sound and the quality of the questionnaire was a major factor in the data collected.

The questionnaire was divided into two main sections. The first section requested information on institutional characteristics that could be used to analyze data by institutional size, type, control and size of non-teaching staff. Only questions that would allow for this procedure were asked as a part of this section of the questionnaire.

Items for the second section of the questionnaire, concerning the specific factors related to evaluation, were adapted from items Dressel presented as guidelines for this type of evaluation. While Dressel presented seven points, these were condensed into four sections dealing with goals and objectives; state of program and restrictions; personal characteristics and style; and the possible components of the evaluation process.

Throughout seven years of administrative work the writer has seen and responded to many and varied types of questionnaires on many subjects. Therefore he was cognizant of the importance of a format which could provide ease of response in order to obtain maximum return. A Likert-type response was provided for all questions regarding the specific factors used in the evaluation process. The respondent was asked to indicate his or her judgment on importance of each factor using a gradated scale ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high) and circling the number of his or her choice.

Institutions were asked if they would like to have a copy of the tabulated results, whether the information received from the questionnaire would

be used or would be helpful in considering their evaluation process, and if the questionnaire had helped to stimulate their thinking about this type of process.

All respondents indicated they would like a copy of the results of the survey and all indicated the questionnaire had stimulated them about this type of evaluation. Only two of the respondents did not report the questionnaire had been helpful to them in considering their evaluation process, for they did not answer the question.

Overview of the Study Report

The study report contains findings that relate to institutions and their evaluation practices. A summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations were presented in Chapter 1. Chapter 3 will deal with institution characteristics and the findings that relate to their lack or type of evaluation process. Specifics on the instituions and of the evaluation practices will be presented.

Information relating to the importance of factors pertaining to consideration of goals and objectives in the evaluation process is presented in Chapter 4. Information will be presented for two-year and four-year colleges and the importance placed on specific factors for each type of institution will be highlighted.

The evaluation categories of state of program and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style will be presented in Chapter 5. Findings will be presented for both types of institutions, two-year and four-year colleges, and factors indicated of relative importance will be presented.

The factors and components of the process of evaluation will be presented in Chapter 6, with attention given to those factors rated of importance by two-year and four-year colleges.

CHAPTER 3

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS ON TYPES OF EVALUATION

Characteristics of the Respondents

Of the 64 institutions surveyed 51, or 79.7 percent responded. Thirty-five respondents, 69 percent, were from public institutions, and 16, 31 percent, were from private institutions. Twenty-two of the respondents were two-year colleges, and the reamining 29 were four-year colleges and universities, 43 percent and 57 percent respectively.

In considering the respondents and the information supplied regarding the evaluation process or the lack thereof, the data will be presented so as to allow description of the institution to be correlated with the type or lack or evaluation practice.

This section provides this information and three tables will be presented. Displayed in the tables will be information relevant to the type and control of the institution, type and enrollment size by headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment, size of the non-teaching professional staff, and control of the institution. Through each of these tables, a correlation to the lack or type of evaluation practice can be observed.

For the purpose of presenting data throughout this report, colleges will be classified by enrollment size in three basic categories: small colleges with enrollments of less than 2,500; medium size colleges with enrollments of 2,500 to 4,999; and large colleges with enrollments of 5,000 or more.

Type of Evaluation Practice by Institution Type and Control

Information on the different types of evaluation process used by different institutions is presented in Table I. Data are shown for both public and private two-year and four-year colleges and/or universities.

TABLE I

EVALUATION PROCESS USED BY TYPE AND CONTROL OF COLLEGES

Type of Evaluation Process	Percent by Institution Type and Control					
	2 Yr. Colleges		4 Yr. Colleges		All Colleges	
	Private (N=0)	Public (N=22)	Private (N=16)	Public (N=13)	Private (N=16)	Public (N=35)
Structured Formal Process Institution-Wide	–	41	27	15	27	31
Structured Formal Process Differ by Organizational Sub-Unit	–	9	–	8	–	9
Basic Process Without Unity of Format and Forms	–	9	–	23	–	14
Non-Structured Informal Process	–	18	12	8	12	14
No Evaluation Process	–	23	62	46	62	14

From observing the data in Table I one can see, for example, that all two-year colleges responding to the survey were public institutions; and, of these, 41 percent have a structured formal process institution-wide. Nine percent have a structured formal process but differing by organizational sub-unit; 9 percent have a basic process without unity of format and form; 18 percent have a non-structured informal process, and 23 percent have no evaluation process. Other data are to be read in a similar fashion.

Sixty-two percent of all private institutions had no evaluation process for their non-teaching professionals, while this was the case for only 14 percent of the public institutions. Another comparison can be made between two-year and four-year public institutions. Forty-one percent of the public two-year colleges had a structured formal process, while only 15 percent of the four-year colleges had this type of evaluation. Of all public two-year and four-year colleges, 23 and 46 percentages, respectively, reported no form of evaluation for non-teaching professional personnel. This would seem to indicate greater accountability on the part of the two-year colleges.

Type of Evaluation Process by Enrollment Size and Institution Type

Data were analyzed by 1976 fall term enrollment size, headcount and full-time equivalent, as well as by type of institution and evaluation practice. These data are presented in Table II. Full-time equivalent enrollments were to be computed on the basis that 12 credits would equal one full-time equivalent student.

TABLE II

PERCENT USING EVALUATION PROCESS BY ENROLLMENT SIZE AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Evaluation Process by Type of Institution	Less than 2,500		2,500-4,999		5,000 or more	
	HC*	FTE#	HC*	FTE#	HC*	FTE#
Structured Formal Process--Institution-Wide						
2-year	–	40	42	50	42	33
4-year	27	39	17	–	18	11
Structured Formal Process--Differ by Org. Sub-Unit						
2-year	–	–	–	–	7	17
4-year	–	–	–	–	9	11
Basic Process Without Unity of Formation or Form						
2-year	–	–	29	10	15	17
4-year	–	–	17	35	18	11
Non-Structured Informal Process						
2-year	–	20	–	30	15	–
4-year	18	15	–	–	4	11
No Evaluation Process						
2-year	–	40	29	10	21	33
4-year	55	46	66	65	45	55

* HC equals head count.
# FTE equals full-time equivalent (12 credit hours equals 1 FTE)

From examining the data in Table II, one can see, for example, that, of the colleges reporting a headcount enrollment of less than 2,500, 27 percent were four-year institutions with a structured formal process institution-wide. In the same enrollment classification, 18 percent were four-year colleges with a non-structured informal process and the remaining 55 percent were four-year colleges having no evaluation process. Other data are to be read likewise.

Of schools having a headcount enrollment of 5,000 or more, 42 percent of the two-year colleges had a formal structured process institution-wide, while only 21 percent had no evaluation process. In the same enrollment classification, 18 percent of four-year colleges had a structured formal process institution-wide, while 45 percent had no evaluation process. The comparison of these data continue to support the indication that two-year colleges are more accountable in the area of evaluation non-teaching professional personnel.

Type of Evaluation by Staff Size and Control

Respondents indicated the numerical size of their non-teaching professional staff. This information by institution type according to evaluation practice is presented in Table III.

TABLE III

EVALUATION PROCESS BY STAFF SIZE AND TYPE OF CONTROL

Type of Evaluation Process	Percent by Staff Size* and Control					
	Less Than 10		25-49		50 or More	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
Structured Formal Process--Institution-Wide	40	–	33	71	40	13
Structured Formal Process--Differ by Organizational Sub-Unit	–	–	–	–	–	13
Basic Process Without Unity of Format or Form	30	–	–	–	–	19
Non-Structured Informal Process	20	–	17	–	20	13
No Evaluation Process	10	100	50	29	40	43

* Staff size indicates the number of non-teaching professionals employed at the institution.

Observing Table III reveals that 40 percent of the private institutions having less than ten non-teaching professional personnel had structured formal process institution-wide, while 30 percent in this classification had a basic process without unity of format or forms. Twenty percent of the private colleges in this category had a non-structured informal process, and 10 percent had no evaluation process for their non-teaching professional personnel. Other data are to be read likewise.

As shown in Table II, 43 percent of the public institutions and 40 percent of the private institutions with 50 or more administrators had no evaluation process for these personnel. Whereas 40 percent of the large private colleges had an institution wide structured formal process and 20 percent had a non-structured formal process, public colleges with a large size administrative staff had other forms of evaluation. Most (71 percent) of the public colleges with a medium size administrative staff (25 to 49) had an institution-wide structured formal process compared to one-third of the private institutions with the same size staff. Larger percentages of the private than public colleges with either a large or small size administrative staff had an institution-wide structured formal evaluation process.

Action to be Taken Regarding Institutional Practice

Respondents were asked if they expected to initiate or modify an evaluation process for non-teaching professionals in the near future. Of the colleges with an evaluation process of some type, 52 percent responded affirmatively, 31 percent responded negatively, 14 percent indicated they did not know, and 3 percent gave no response. Forty-three percent of the colleges with no evaluation process responded affirmatively; 19 percent had no such expectations, 24 percent did not know, and 14 percent gave no response.

Indications are that slightly over one-half of the institutions having an evaluation process are concerned that the process is effective. At the same time the majority of colleges without this type of evaluation process do not seem committed to initiating one.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS ON THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Introduction

The investigator sought to determine the importance ascribed by respondents to goals and objectives in the evaluation process. Eight questions were presented to the repondents to indicate the importance they ascribed to each using a one to five Likert-type scale.

Inquiry was made as to the relative importance in evaluation of a non-teaching employee of such factors as the overall goals of the institution, objectives of the sub-units, and the individuals participation in the establishing current and future objectives. Factors considered were the importance of continuing evaluation of the objectives for feasibility, how well the individual met specific predetermined objectives, the alignment of these objectives with organizational sub-unit programs, and whether the evaluation focused only on how well the individual met specific objectives.

For the purpose of interpreting results, the writer found it necessary to establish categories of importance. The scale used by respondents to indicate importance ranged from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The classification scheme devised for interpreting average rated weightings was as follows:

Low importance----------1.0 to 2.2
Medium importance----------2.3 to 3.7
High importance----------3.8 to 5.0

While the classification scheme was arbitrarily established by the investigator, approximately one-third of the full range of ratings possible were included within each category.

Responses were categorized by type of institution, either two-year or four-year. Within these categories, data on importance for each individual factor have been reported for public and private colleges.

Two-Year Colleges

All two-year colleges that responded to the study were public institutions. The average rated weightings of importance for each individual factor pertaining to goals and objectives, categorized by college enrollment size, are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

IMPORTANCE OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to Goals and Objectives	Importance* by Size** and Control			
	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
Institutional Goals	4.0	4.4	3.2	3.9
Sub-unit objectives	4.0	4.6	4.0	4.3
Individual participation in own objectives	4.3	4.4	3.4	4.1
Conference with supervisor to set future objectives	4.3	3.6	3.4	3.7
Evaluation of objectives for feasibility	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8
Accomplishment of pre-determined objectives	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.3
Meeting goals and objectives is only focus	3.3	2.8	3.6	3.1
Alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.9

* Figures reported are the average weighted ratings of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent enrollment.

By examining the data presented in Table IV one can see that, among two-year colleges least (medium) importance was given in large institutions to consideration of institutional goals as a factor in the evaluation process. Colleges of less than 5,000 students rated this factor as of high importance. Respondents from medium size colleges reported consideration of this factor as being of slightly higher importance than did those from small size colleges (4.4 compared to 4.0). The same appears to be true for the factor of individual participation in establishing his or her own objectives.

Two factors considered as of most importance in this area by respondents of all two-year colleges were sub-unit objectives and accomplishment of predetermined objectives. The factor of sub-unit objectives was rated at a level of high importance at small and large size colleges with average weighted ratings of 4.0 and 4.6 respectively. Accomplishment of predetermined objectives was rated at the level of high importance by small, medium and large size colleges with average weighted ratings of 4.3, 4.0 and 4.4, respectively. Each of both factors received a total composite average weighted rating of 4.3. The factor judged to be of least importance (medium) in the evaluation of non-teaching professionals was meeting goals and objectives as the only focus of evaluation. The rating from small colleges of this factor was 3.8; for middle size colleges 2.8; and for large size colleges 3.6. The average weighted rating for this factor for all colleges was 3.1, or of medium importance.

The factors of greatest importance varied among two-year colleges according to enrollment size. Among small institutions the factors of most importance in evaluation were participation of the individual in establishing the objectives, conference with a supervisor to set future objectives, and the accomplishment of predetermined objectives. Of greatest importance among

medium size colleges were the factors of institutional goals, sub-unit objectives, and conference with a supervisor for setting future objectives. Of most importance among large size colleges were the factors of sub-unit objectives and the accomplishment of predetermined objectives.

Accomplishment of predetermined objectives and sub-unit objectives, both rated high for colleges of each size category, were important factors for two-year colleges in evaluation of their non-teaching professionals. Other factors of importance were participation by the individual in establishing his objectives, and how well the individual performed in consideration of the institution's goals. However these factors were of less importance in large institutions than the other size two-year colleges. Meeting goals and objectives were important factors in the evaluation process but, as the only focus, they were of least importance.

Four-Year Colleges

All respondents indicating private control had full-time equivalent enrollments of less than 2,500 students and were four-year types of institutions. The average weighted ratings of importance for factors pertaining to goals and objectives, categorized by college size and type of control, are presented in Table V.

TABLE V

IMPORTANCE OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to Goals and Objectives	Importance* by Size** and Control				
	Less than 2,500 Private	Less than 2,500 Public	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
Institutional goals	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2
Sub-unit objectives	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.4
Individual participation in own objectives	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.3	3.8
Conference with a supervisor to set future objectives	3.8	2.0	5.0	3.8	3.6
Evaluation of objectives for feasibility	3.6	2.0	5.0	3.3	3.2
Accomplishment of pre-determined objectives	4.0	2.0	5.0	3.8	3.7
Meeting goals and objectives is only focus	1.8	1.8	3.0	3.0	2.2
Alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs	3.7	3.0	5.0	3.8	3.7

* Figures reported are the average rated weighting of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent enrollment.

From observing the data presented in Table V one can see that, consideration of overall institutional goals was reported as a factor of high importance in all four-year colleges. Sub-unit objectives, as a factor in evaluation of non-teaching professionals, was rated the highest of all factors by all four-year colleges with a composite rating of 4.4. This factor was rated for small private colleges at 4.7 and 4.0 for small public colleges. For medium and large size colleges, all of which were public institutions, ratings of importance for this factor were 4.0 and 4.3, respectively.

Participation of individuals in establishing their own objectives as a factor was rated 4.0 and 5.0, or of high importance for small and medium size colleges respectively, while for importance among large colleges it was given a medium rating of 3.3. The overall rating by all colleges was 3.8, a rating of high importance for this factor. Another factor rated of high importance to the evaluation of non-teaching professionals for all colleges was a conference with a supervisor to set future objectives (3.8). Accomplishment of predetermined objectives was rated for all colleges at 3.7, or of medium importance, as was the alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs.

Importance of meeting goals and objectives as the only focus of evaluation was rated for all four-year colleges as low (2.2). Small colleges, both private and public, rated this factor as of low importance with a rating of 1.8, while importance at medium and large size colleges for this factor was 3.0, or of medium importance.

Whereas the highest level of importance for small and large four-year colleges was on institutional goals and sub-unit objectives, the highest levels of importance for medium size colleges were on the factors of individual participation in establishing their own objectives, conference with a

supervisor to set future objectives, evaluation of objectives for feasibility, alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs, and the accomplishment of predetermined objectives.

The highest level of importance for four-year colleges was placed on considering the institutional goals, sub-unit objectives, and participation of the individual in the establishment of his or her own objectives. Alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs, a conference with a supervisor to set future objectives, and accomplishment of predetermined objectives were judged to be of medium importance in the individual's evaluation. Meeting goals and objectives as the only focus of evaluating non-teaching professional personnel was judged to be of low importance for all colleges.

Summary

Data presented in this chapter indicate there was relative agreement between two-year and four-year colleges on those factors of both high and low importance. Consideration of institutional goals and participation of the individual in the establishment of his or her own objectives were factors rated high in importance for both types of colleges. Both placed relatively high importance on the alignment of individual objectives and sub-unit programs, and on accomplishment of predetermined objectives. The factor rated lowest for both types of colleges was that of considering the meeting of goals and objectives as the only focus for evaluating non-teaching professional personnel.

The rating pattern was different by type of institution. The factors of institutional goals and sub-unit objectives were judged to be of higher importance among four-year than two-year colleges. For all other factors, the average weighted ratings of importance were higher among two-year than four-year colleges. Even the factor rated lowest for two-year colleges had average weighted ratings higher than those assigned for four-year colleges.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS ON RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO STATE OF PROGRAMS AND RESTRICTIONS, AND TO PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STYLE

Introduction

This chapter contains findings on the two categories that dealt with the importance of factors related to the limitations and restrictions placed on the program of the individual being evaluated and his/her personal characteristics and style of administration. Four specific factors are related to each of these areas.

Regarding the state of the program and restrictions placed on it, respondents were asked the relative importance of the status of the sub-unit or program at the time the administrator assumed initial responsibilities, and of the restrictions on program operation imposed by tradition or regulation. Respondents were also asked to indicate the importance of considering the level of institutional support and organizational restructuring or program revision that was in progress for the period covered by evaluation.

Regarding personal characteristics and style, inquiry was made as to the importance of considering the individual's style of administration in contrast to institutional style. Respondents were also asked the importance of considering the effect of the individual's personality on the operations, the individual's approach to decision making, and the involvement of the individual's subordinates in decisions made at a higher level.

Responses were categorized for two-year and four-year institutions, and within these categories responses were reported for public and private colleges for each individual factor.

Two-Year Colleges

Respondents from two-year colleges did not place the same degree of importance on the state of the program and restrictions or on the personal characteristics and style as they did on goals and objectives when evaluating their non-teaching professional personnel. The responses to questions presented on these categories are displayed in Table VI, and the same classification scheme used in Chapter 4 for interpretation purposes was also used here.[1] From observing the data, one can see the relatively lower levels of importance indicated by respondents in these areas.

---

[1] Supra, p. 22.

TABLE VI

IMPORTANCE OF STATE OF PROGRAMS AND RESTRICTIONS AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STYLE IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to State of Programs and Restrictions and Personal Characteristics and Style	Importance* by Size** and Control***			
	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
Operational status of sub-unit when assumed by administrator	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.9
Restrictions imposed by tradition and regulation	3.0	3.3	3.8	3.4
Level of institutional support	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.2
Disruption of program caused by restructuring	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.7
Individual style vs. institutional style	2.7	3.6	4.0	3.6
Effect of the individual's personality	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.5
Individual's approach to his or her decisions	3.3	3.9	4.0	3.6
Subordinates' involvement in higher level decisions	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.4

* Figures are the average weighted ratings of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent students.

*** All two-year colleges were publicly controlled.

Observing the data in Table VI, one can see, for example, that, in considering the operational status of the sub-unit when assumed by the administrator, importance for small two-year colleges (less than 2.500) was rated of medium importance at 3.7, while importance for medium size colleges (2.500 to 4,999) and for large size colleges (5,000 or more) was rated as of high importance with average weighted ratings of 4.0 and 3.8, respectively. The composite rating of this factor for all colleges was the only one within this category classified as being of high importance in that the average weighted rating was 3.9. Ratings of all other factors in these categories was of medium importance for all colleges, and no factors were rated as being of low importance.

Although each factor was considered to be of medium importance to small two-year colleges, three factors were considered to have high importance among medium size colleges according to ratings of importance. They were the (1) operational status of the sub-unit when the person being evaluated assumed responsibility, (2) disruption of the program caused by restructuring, and (3) the individual's approach to his or her decisions. Based on ratings by large size colleges, the same three factors were considered to be of high importance; but, in addition, the factors of individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration and restrictions enforced by tradition and regulation were considered also to be of high importance.

Disruption of program caused by restructuring received average weighted ratings for medium and large colleges of 3.9 and 3.8, respectively. However, a relatively low average weighted rating for small colleges of 3.0, caused this factor to receive an overall medium level rating for all colleges of 3.7. The individual's approach to his or her decisions followed the same pattern having received high ratings of importance by respondents of medium

and large colleges of 3.9 and 4.0, respectively. A medium level rating for small colleges of 3.3 resulted in an overall average weighted rating for all colleges of 3.6, a medium level of importance. Individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration was of medium level importance as indicated by ratings from small and medium size colleges of 2.7 and 3.6 respectively. This factor was of high importance in large size colleges as indicated by a high rating of 4.0. An overall composite rating for all two-year colleges of 3.6 indicated this factor was of medium level importance.

Within the categories of state of programs and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style, the most important factors for all two-year colleges were operational status of the sub-unit when assumed by the administrator, disruption of the program caused by restructuring, individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration, and the individual's approach to his or her decisions. Each of these factors were rated lower for small two-year colleges than for medium and large size colleges. Individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration received a rating from large size two-year colleges indicating a high level of importance. Responses from large size colleges indicated a generally higher level of rating to this category of factors, while the average weighted ratings for small size colleges tended to be generally lower. The average weighted ratings of responses for medium size colleges have a distinct tendency to parallel the overall composite ratings for all two-year colleges.

Four-Year Colleges

Responses from four-year colleges also placed less emphasis on the relative importance of state of programs and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style as opposed to goals and objectives in evaluating

non-teaching professional personnel. Information on the level of consideration of these factors is presented in Table VII; and , from observing this information, one can see the relative lower importance placed on the consideration of these factors.

TABLE VII

IMPORTANCE OF STATE OF PROGRAMS AND RESTRICTIONS AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STYLE IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to State of Programs and Restrictions and Personal Characteristics and Style	Importance* by Size** and Control				
	Less than 2,500		2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
	Private	Public			
Operational status of sub-unit when assumed by administrator	3.5	2.5	4.0	3.5	3.4
Restrictions imposed by tradition and regulation	3.3	2.5	5.0	3.5	3.4
Level of institutional support	2.2	2.0	5.0	3.0	2.7
Disruption of program caused by restructuring	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.8	3.5
Individual style vs. institutional style	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.8	3.7
Effect of individual's personality	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.8	3.7
Individual's approach to his or her decisions	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.8
Subordinates involvement in higher level decisions	3.5	2.5	5.0	3.0	3.4

* Figures are the average weighted ratings of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent students.

From observing the data presented in Table VII, one can see, for example, that operational status of the sub-unit when assumed by the administrator received ratings at a level of medium importance from small size colleges, both private and public with average weighted ratings of 3.5 and 2.5, respectively. Ratings from medium size colleges for this factor were at a high level of importance at 4.0; and, from large size colleges ratings were of medium level of importance at 3.5. The overall composite rating of this factor from all four-year colleges was 3.4, an indication of medium level of importance.

Only one factor in these categories was rated at a high level of importance in responses from four-year colleges. The individual's approach to his or her decisions was rated of high importance from small size private colleges, medium size colleges, and large size colleges, all rating this factor at 4.0. Responses from small size public colleges placed this factor of medium importance at 2.5, and the overall composite rating from all colleges was computed at 3.8, classified as a high level of importance.

Small size private college responses indicated three factors of high importance. They were those of individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration, effect of the individual's personality, and the individual's approach to his or her decisions. These factors as well as disruption of program caused by restructuring were indicated to be of high importance from large size colleges. Medium size college responses rated all eight factors at a high level of importance, and responses from small size public colleges rated all factors in these areas as being of a medium level of importance.

Factors that were rated as of relatively high importance as shown by composite responses from four-year colleges in the evaluation of their

non-teaching professional personnel were: individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration was rated of high importance from small size private colleges (4.0), medium size colleges (4.0) and large size colleges (3.8). However, the medium level rating (2.5) from small size public colleges caused a composite overall rating from all colleges to be of a medium level of importance (3.7). Effect of the individual's personality was given the same average weighted ratings by respondents from colleges of each size and control, as was the factor of considering contrasting styles of administration.

In the categories of state of programs and restrictions, and personal characteristics and style, factors rated as receiving the most consideration from four-year colleges were the individual's approach to his or her decisions (rated at a level of high importance), individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration, and effect of the individual's personality, both indicated to be of a medium level of importance.

Responses from large size four-year colleges tended to parallel the average weighted ratings from all colleges. From small public colleges the tendency of average weighted ratings for all factors was consistantly below the composite ratings. Respondents from small private colleges and large public colleges rated these categories of evaluation at the same level of importance. While .8 of a point in average weighting of importance separated these two classifications of colleges on the factors of level of institutional support and disruption of program caused by restructuring, only .5 of a point separated these classifications of colleges on the factor of subordinates' involvement in higher level decisions. All other factors in these categories differed by only .2 of a point of average weighted rating or were rated at the same level.

While all eight of the factors were rated of high importance for medium size colleges, the number of responses from four-year institutions was not sufficient to allow general statements of evaluation practice. This was demonstrated by the general lack of effect that weighting of the first and last factors in Table VII from medium size colleges had on the composite weighting by all colleges.

Summary

Factors that were rated of some importance by both two-year and four-year colleges were the individual's approach to his or her decisions, rated of medium and high importance respectively, and individual style in contrast to institutional style of administration, rated of medium importance by both types of colleges. Two-year colleges also placed an emphasis on the factors of operational status of the program when assumed by the administrator (high level of importance) and disruption of the program caused by restructuring (medium level of importance). In addition to the factors in common with two-year colleges, responses from four-year colleges placed an emphasis on effect of the individual's personality. This factor was rated at a level of medium importance in the evaluation of non-teaching professional personnel.

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS ON THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS RELATED TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Introduction

The ascribed importance to specific factors and components of the evaluation process was of concern also to the investigator. Nine items were presented to secure information on this ascribed importance.

Items were presented allowing for a gradated indication of level of importance on the 1 (low) to 5 (high) Likert-type scale. The response indicated the relative importance of such factors as: self-evaluation; evaluation by subordinates; peer evaluation; an evaluation conference with a supervisor; and an interview with the final signature authority. Also included in this category were factors such as the individual's opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation, the purpose of the process being evaluated, results of evaluation being used for personal development, and results of evaluation being used for salary and promotional purposes.

Responses have been analyzed by type of institution, either two-year or four-year and by control, public or private.

Two-Year Colleges

Two-year colleges' responses indicated that a number of factors related to the evaluation process were of high importance. The level of importance associated with these factors was more like that of the goals and objectives category with four of the factors rated high and five rated medium

by the two-year colleges. Once again the classification scheme presented in Chapter 4 for interpretation purposes was used here.[1]

Weighted ratings by respondents of two-year colleges for all of the nine factors are presented in Table VIII.

[1] Supra, p. 22.

TABLE VIII

IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to the Process	Importance* by Size** and Control***			
	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
Self-evaluation	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.2
Subordinate evaluation	4.0	3.0	2.2	2.9
Peer evaluation	4.5	3.4	3.8	3.7
Conference with a supervisor	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.5
Interview with final signature authority	2.7	3.8	3.8	3.5
Individual has opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation	4.3	4.0	4.6	4.3
Purpose of process is evaluated	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.7
Results used for personal development	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.0
Results used for salary and promotion	2.7	3.1	3.4	3.1

* Figures are average weighted ratings of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent enrollment.

*** All two-year colleges were publicly controlled.

From observing the data presented in Table VIII, one can see that the importance of a self-evaluation component in the evaluation process for non-teaching professional personnel was rated high in importance according to average weighted responses from all colleges. For small colleges, enrollment under 2,500, rating of this factor was 4.7, or of a high level of importance; and for medium size colleges, enrollment between 2,500 and 4.999, the rating of this factor was 4.0, also of high importance. For large colleges, having an enrollment of 5,000 or more, the average weighted rating of the self-evaluation component was 4.2, and the composite rating of this factor for all two-year colleges was 4.2, both of high importance.

Other factors that were rated of high importance from two-year colleges were: an evaluation conference with a supervisor; the individual having the opportunity to respond to each level of the evaluation process; and the results of the evaluation process being used for personal development. An evaluation conference with a supervisor was rated of high importance from all size categories of colleges. Average weighted ratings by respondents from small, medium, and large size colleges were 4.7, 4.4, and 4.4, respectively. The overall composite rating for this component was 4.5. The same is true for the individual having the opportunity to respond at all levels of evaluation, in that colleges of each size classification rated this factor of high importance with average ratings of 4.3, 4.0, and 4.6, respectively, for small, medium, and large size colleges. The composite rating of this factor for all colleges was 4.3.

The other factor with an overall rating in the category of high importance was use of the results of evaluation for personal development. Average weighted ratings for medium and large size colleges were 4.1, and 4.0,

respectively. Respondents from small size colleges rated this factor at a medium level of importance, 3.7; however, the overall rating of this factor was of high importance at 4.0.

Factors of high importance from all size classifications of two-year colleges were self-evaluation; an evaluation conference with a supervisor; and, the individual's opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation. Responses from small size colleges also placed a high level of importance on the factors of subordinate evaluation and peer evaluation, while all other factors were rated of medium importance. Respondents from medium and large size colleges indicated agreement that the factors of an interview with the final signature authority and use of the results for personal development were of high importance. Respondents from medium size college also rated the purpose of the process as being of high importance, while respondents from large size colleges indicated a high level rating for peer evaluation.

Components of the actual process of evaluating non-teaching professional personnel of a higher level of importance in two-year colleges were self-evaluation; an evaluation conference with a supervisor; the individual having the opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation; and, the use of results for personal development.

The factors in the evaluation process receiving the lowest rating were those of subordinate evaluation and use of the results for salary and promotion. These factors were rated as of medium importance in the composite ratings of all colleges, and they were rated at 2.9 and 3.1, respectively.

Four-Year Colleges

Factors in the evaluation process for non-teaching professional personnel were rated by four-year colleges at similar levels as those of goals

and objectives. Five of the nine items in this area were rated of high importance by respondents from four-year colleges, and the data from these responses in terms of average weighted ratings are displayed in Table IX.

TABLE IX

IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS
FOR FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Factors Related to the Process	Importance* by Size** and Control				
	Less than 2,500		2,500 to 4,999	5,000 or More	All Colleges
	Private	Public			
Self-evaluation	3.7	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.8
Subordinate evaluation	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Peer evaluation	3.4	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.6
Conference with a supervisor	3.8	5.0	4.0	4.3	4.2
Interview with final signature authority	3.4	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.3
Individual has opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation	3.8	5.0	5.0	3.3	3.9
Purpose of process is evaluated	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.2
Results used for personal development	4.4	5.0	5.0	3.8	4.3
Results used for salary and promotion	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.8

* Figures are average weighted ratings of all responses in this classification.

** Institution size is represented by the reported full-time equivalent enrollment.

From observing the data in Table IX one can see, for example, that, self-evaluation as a component of the process was rated differently by respondents from private and public small size four-year colleges. In this size classification, private colleges' rating of this factor was of medium level of importance at 3.7 and public colleges' rating was of high importance at 5.0. For medium size colleges, rating of this factor was of high level of importance at 5.0, while for large size colleges the rating of self-evaluation was of medium importance with an average weighted rating of 3.0. The composite overall rating for this factor for all colleges was a high level of importance at 3.8.

Other factors in the evaluation process rated of high importance by responses from four-year colleges include an evaluation conference with a supervisor; the individual's opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation; and, results being used for salary and promotion, as well as personal development.

Responses from small size private colleges rated three factors as of a high level of importance. Two of these factors: an evaluation conference with a supervisor; and results being used for personal development, were rated of high importance for all sizes of colleges. The individual's opportunity to respond to each level of evaluation was also rated of high importance for small size privately controlled colleges. Medium size colleges' responses indicated a high level of importance for all factors or components of the evaluation process. This would also be true of responses for small size public colleges with the exception that the factor of an interview with the final signature authority was rated as being of medium level of importance.

In addition to the two factors of high importance in common with all other size of four-year colleges, respondents of large size colleges indicated a high level of importance for the use of the results of the evaluation for salary and promotion.

For small colleges, both private and public, ratings of 3.8 and 5.0, respectively, were at a high level of importance for an evaluation conference. The high ratings for this factor among medium and large size colleges were 4.0 and 4.3, respectively, and the overall composite rating for all colleges was 4.2.

Results used for personal development as a factor of the process was rated 4.4 and 5.0, or of high importance, for private and public small colleges, respectively. Medium and large size colleges' ratings for this factor were of a high level of importance with average weighted ratings of 5.0 and 3.8, respectively. The overall composite rating of 4.3 for all four-year colleges was of high importance.

The individual having an opportunity to respond to all levels as a factor of evaluation was rated of high importance for three classifications of four-year colleges having received rating of 3.8, 5.0, and 5.0, respectively, from small private, small public, and medium size colleges. For large size colleges this factor was rated as of a medium level of importance at 3.3; however, the composite rating for all colleges was high, at 3.9.

Use of the results for salary and promotion as a factor in evaluation was rated high for all public four-year colleges having received ratings of 4.0, 5.0, and 4.0, respectively, from small, medium, and large size colleges. Small size private colleges' rating for this factor was of medium importance at 3.0; however, the overall composite rating for all four-year colleges at 3.8 indicated a high level of importance.

An emphasis was placed by respondents from four-year colleges in the evaluation process on the factors of self-evaluation, conference with a supervisor, the opportunity of the individual to respond to each level of evaluation, and use of the results for both personal development and salary

and promotional purposes. All of these factors were rated at a high level of importance. The only factors that appeared not to be of significant importance in the evaluation process were subordinate evaluation, an interview with the final signature authority, and evaluation of the purpose of the evaluation process. All of these factors were rated at a medium level of importance but received composite ratings of 3.0, 3.3, and 3.2, respectively, from all four-year colleges.

Summary

Respondents from both two-year and four-year colleges rated similarly the factors in the evaluation process. Four of these factors were rated of high importance by both public and private colleges while they differed in what was considered least important in this category for evaluation of non-teaching professional personnel.

Factors rated of high importance in the process for both types of colleges were self-evaluation; an evaluation interview with a supervisor; opportunity for the individual to respond to all levels of evaluation; and use of the results for personal development. Use of the results for salary and promotion was rated of high importance for four-year colleges, while ratings of respondents from two-year colleges indicated it was of medium and lesser importance in this category of evaluation factors.

Responses from two-year and four-year colleges agreed in rating subordinate evaluation as a factor of least importance. Respondents from four-year colleges rated an interview with the final signature authority and evaluation of the purpose of the process as of lesser importance. These two factors were rated at a medium level of importance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Dressel, Paul L. Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Vermilye, Dryckman W., ed. The Expanded Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Anderson, Scarvia, B., et al. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Borg, Walter R. and Gill, Meredith D. Educational Research, An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1971.

Glock, Charles Y. Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1967.

Miller, Richard I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS IN THE STUDY GROUP

APPENDIX I

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS IN THE STUDY GROUP

Institution	Responded
BELLEVUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Bellevue, WA Dr. Merle E. Landerholm	. . .
BIG BEND COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Moses Lake, WA Dr. Robert J. Wallenstien	. . .
BOISE STATE, Boise, ID Dr. John B. Barnes	X
CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Bend, OR Dr. Frederick H. Boyle	X
CENTRAL WASTHINGTON STATE, Ellensberg, WA Dr. James E. Brooks	X
CENTRALIA COLLEGE, Centralia, WA Dr. Nels W. Hanson	X
CLACKAMAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Oregon City, OR Dr. John W. Hakanson	X
CLATSOP COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Astoria, OR Mr. Philip L. Bainer	. . .
COLLEGE OF IDAHO, Caldwell, ID Mr. William C. Cassell	X
COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDAHO, Twin Falls, ID Dr. James L. Taylor	X
COLUMBIA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE, Portland, OR Dr. J. P. Sanders	. . .
EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE, La Grande, OR Dr. Rodney A. Briggs	X
EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE, Cheney, WA Dr. Emerson C. Shuck	X
GEORGE FOX COLLEGE, Newberg, OR Dr. David C. le Shana	X

Institution	Responded
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY, Spokane, WA Rev. Bernard J. Coughlin	X
GRAYS HARBOR COLLEGE, Aberdeen, WA Mr. Joseph A. Malik	X
GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Auburn, WA Dr. Melvin R. Lindbloom	X
HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Midway WA Dr. Orville C. Carnahan	X
IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY, Pocatello, ID Dr. William E. Davis	X
LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Eugene, OR Dr. Eldon G. Schafer	X
LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE, Portland, OR Dr. John R. Howard	X
LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE, Lewiston, ID Dr. Jerold O. Dugger	. . .
LINN-BENTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Albany, OR Dr. Raymond J. Needham	X
MT. HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Gresham, OR Dr. Earl L. Klapstein	X
NORTH IDAHO COLLEGE, Coeur D'Alene, ID Mr. Barry G. Schuler	. . .
NORTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Seattle, WA Dr. Cecil Baxter, Jr.	X
N.W. COLLEGE, ASSEMBLIES OF GOD, Kirkland, WA Dr. D. V. Hurst	X
OREGON GRADUATE CENTER, Beaverton, OR Mr. Ira C. Keller	. . .
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, Corvallis, OR Mr. Robert W. Macvicar	X
PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY, Tacoma, WA Mr. Richard Jungkuntz, Acting President	X
PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Portland, OR Mr. Amo De Bernardis	X
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, Portland, OR Dr. Joseph C. Blumel	X

Institution	Responded
REED COLLEGE, Portland, OR Mr. Paul E. Bragdon	X
ST. MARTINS COLLEGE, Olympia, WA Rev. Matthew Naumes	X
SEATTLE CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Seattle, WA Dr. Roy G. Phillips	X
SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY, Seattle, WA Dr. David L. McKenna	X
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY, Seattle, WA Rev. Louis Gaffney	X
SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE, Sitka, AK Dr. Merton D. Munn	. . .
SHORELINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Seattle, WA Dr. Richard S. White	X
SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE, Mt. Vernon, WA Dr. Norwood M. Cole	X
SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE, Ashland, OR Mr. James K. Sours	X
SOUTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Seattle, WA Dr. Robert C. Smith	X
SPOKANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Spokane, WA Mr. Lloyd E. Stannard	X
TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Tacoma, WA Dr. Thornton M. Ford	X
THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE, Olympia, WA Mr. Charles J. McCann	X
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, Anchorage, AK Dr. John Lindauer, Chancellor	X
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, Fairbanks, AK Dr. Charles O. Ferguson	. . .
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, SOUTHEAST, Juneau, AK Dr. Charles Fields, Chancellor	. . .
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, Moscow, ID Dr. Ernest W. Hartung	X

Institution	Responded
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, OR Dr. Robert D. Clark	. . .
UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND, Portland, OR Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt	X
UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND, Tacoma, WA Mr. Philip M. Phibbs	X
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, Seattle, WA Dr. John R. Hogness	X
WALLA WALLA COLLEGE, College Place, WA Dr. Robert L. Reynolds	. . .
WARNER PACIFIC COLLEGE, Portland, OR Dr. E. Joe Gilliam	X
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Pullman, WA Dr. Glenn Terrell	X
WENATCHEE VALLEY COLLEGE, Wenatchee, WA Dr. William E. Steward	X
WESTERN BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE, Salem, OR Mr. W. Thomas Younger	X
WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE, Bellingham, WA Dr. Charles J. Flora	X
WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Bellingham, WA Dr. Robert E. Hamill	X
WHITMAN COLLEGE, Walla Walla, WA Mr, Kenyon A. Knopf, Acting President	. . .
WHITWORTH COLLEGE, Spokane, WA Dr. Edward B. Lindaman	X
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY, Salem, OR Dr. Robert P. Lisensky	X
YAKIMA VALLEY COLLEGE, Yakima, WA Dr. William B. Russell	X

APPENDIX II

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX II

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PRACTICES IN EVALUATING NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Introduction: This is a study of practice in the evaluation of non-teaching professional personnel in higher educational institutions. Professional personnel to be included perform staff and/or administrative services as their primary responsibility and include such persons as Vice Presidents and central administrative office coordinators/ supervisors/staff, Deans of Students/Student Services, Registrar, Director of Admissions, business managers, Academic Deans/Directors, Director of Institutional Research and/or Planning/Development, and Division or Department Chairmen. The latter are to be included only if their primary responsibility is administrative. Directions: Please answer each question according to instructions.

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of institution_____

2. Title of person responding_____

3. Type of institution? (check one)
   ___1. Community College
   ___2. Junior College
   ___3. Four Year College or University

4. Type of control? (check one)
   ___1. Public
   ___2. Private Independent
   ___3. Private Church Related

5. Student headcount enrollment, Fall 1976? (check one)
   ___1. Less than 1,000
   ___2. 1,000 - 2,499
   ___3. 2,500 - 4,499
   ___4. 5,000 - 9,999
   ___5. 10,000 or more

6. Full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, Fall 1976 (based on one FTE equals 12 credit hours)? (check one)
   ___1. Less than 1,000
   ___2. 1,000 - 2,499
   ___3. 2,500 - 4,499
   ___4. 5,000 - 9,999
   ___5. 10,000 or more

7. Number of non-teaching professional personnel? (check one)
   ___1. Less than 10
   ___2. 10 - 24
   ___3. 25 - 49
   ___4. 50 - 100
   ___5. Over 100

8. Type of evaluation process for non-teaching professional personnel?
   ___1. Structured Formal Process - Institution - Wide
   ___2. Structured Formal Process - Differ By Organizational Sub-Units
   ___3. Basic Process Without Unity Of Format Or Form
   ___4. Non-Structured Informal Process
   ___5. No Evaluation Process*
   ___6. Other: _____

9. Do you expect to initiate or modify an evaluation process for non-teaching professionals in the near future? (check one)
   ___1. Yes
   ___2. No
   ___3. Don't Know

* If there is no operative evaluation process, turn to Part II, Section V.

PART II - IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC FACTORS

Directions: Indicate the importance of each factor in your evaluation process by drawing a circle around the appropriate digit on the scale opposite each item in which "1" indicates "little or no" importance, and "5" indicates "very high or extreme" importance.

I GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. In evaluating the individual's performance, the overall goals of the institution are considered. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Objectives of the organizational sub-unit are considered in evaluating an individual's performance. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Individual non-teaching professional personnel participate in establishing their own objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Individual future objectives are established in conference with a superior to whom one reports. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The objectives for an individual are evaluated periodically, at least annually, as to feasibility. 1 2 3 4 5
6. How well an individual meets specific predetermined objectives is considered in evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The evaluation is focused only on how well the individual has met specific objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Individual objectives are in line with organizational sub-unit programs. 1 2 3 4 5

II STATE OF PROGRAMS AN RESTRICTIONS

1. In the evaluation, consideration is given to the status of the program or operation at the time the individual assumed initial responsibilities. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Restrictions on program operation imposed by tradition or regulation are considered in an individual's evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Level of institutional support for a program is considered in an individual's evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5
4. If organizational restructuring or program revision has been in progress during the evaluative period, that is considered in evaluating individual performance. 1 2 3 4 5

III EVALUATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS & STYLE

1. An individual's style of administration, (in contrast to institutional style) is considered. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The effect of the individual's personality on operations is considered. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The individual's approach to his decisions is considered. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The individual's subordinates involvement in decisions made at a higher level is considered. 1 2 3 4 5

IV THE PROCESS

1. Self-evaluation is a component of the process. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Evaluation by subordinates is a corponent of the process. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Peer evaluation is a component of the process. 1 2 3 4 5
4. An evaluation conference with one's supervisor is a component. 1 2 3 4 5
5. An interview with the final signature authority is a component of the process. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The individual has the opportunity to respond to each level of written evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The purpose of the process is evaluated and, if needed, modified regularly. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Results of the evaluation are used for individual self-development and improvement of performance. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Results of the evaluation are used for salary and promotional purposes. 1 2 3 4 5

V STUDY RESULTS

1. I would like a copy of the tabulated results of the study. 1. Yes 2. No
2. Information received from this questionnaire will be used or will be helpful in considering our evaluation process. 1. Yes 2. No
3. This questionnaire has helped to stimulate my thinking about this type of process. 1. Yes 2. No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES